| 1 2 3 4 | David M. Poore, SBN 192541 KAHN BROWN & POORE LLP 755 Baywood Drive, Suite 185 Petaluma, California 94954 Telephone: (707) 763-7100 Facsimile: (707) 763-7180 dpoore@kahnbrownlaw.com | |
|--|--|--|
| 5 | Attorneys for Plaintiff BRIAN J. PATENAUDE | |
| 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 12 | Gregory G. Spaulding, SBN 106606 Lisa Ann Hilario, SBN 148460 Spaulding McCullough & Tansil LLP 90 South "E" St #200 PO Box 1867 Santa Rosa, CA 95402-1867 Telephone: (707) 524-1900 Facsimile: (707) 524-1906 e-mail: hilario@smlaw.com Attorneys for Defendants COUNTY OF SONOMA of which SONOMA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTM is a department | 1ENT |
| 15 | is a department | |
| 16 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 17 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 18 | BRIAN J. PATENAUDE, | Case No. C06-07783 MHP |
| 19 | Plaintiff, | JOINT STIPULATION AND PROPOSED |
| 20 | v. | ORDER TO CONTINUE THE INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND RE-SET DEADLINES |
| 21 22 23 24 | COUNTY OF SONOMA; SONOMA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; SEAN MCDERMOTT; DOLORES ROBINSON; RANDY NORTH; PHILLIP LAWRENCE; and DOES 1 through 50, | Current Case Management Conference: April 30, 2007, 4:00 p.m. Hon. Marilyn Hall Patel |
| 25 | inclusive, Defendants. | |
| 26 27 28 | -1- JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE | |
| | PATENAUDE V. COUNTY OF SONOMA, ET AL., CASE NO. C06-07783 MHP | |

WHEREAS, a Case Management Conference in the above-captioned matter is currently set for April 30, 2007, at 4:00 p.m., before this Court;

WHEREAS, lead trial counsel representing Plaintiff plans to attend the Case Management Conference in person, but has a pre-scheduled family-medical leave during the period of approximately April 25, 2007 through May 8, 2007. The period of leave may be longer depending upon the circumstances;

WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiff and counsel for Defendant COUNTY OF SONOMA are in the process of meeting and conferring to discuss and possibly resolve a potential motion under Rule 12. The requested continuance would allow the parties to continue their meet and confer efforts and potentially resolve the matter without the necessity of filing a motion. However, the parties need additional time to conduct research and further meet and confer to potentially avoid Court intervention in this matter;

WHEREAS, the individual defendants SEAN MCDERMOTT; DOLORES ROBINSON; RANDY NORTH; PHILLIP LAWRENCE have not yet been served with the complaint in this action. Counsel for the Defendant COUNTY OF SONOMA is conferring with her client regarding accepting service on behalf of these individual defendants who are employees of the COUNTY. An extension of time would allow the remaining individual defendants to file and serve any responsive pleading at the same time as defendant COUNTY OF SONOMA;

WHEREAS, there was some initial delay in service of the complaint in that Plaintiff's counsel was out of the office on family-medical leave during the months of January and February 2007;

WHEREAS, the parties have jointly agreed and stipulated to respectfully request that this Court continue the Case Management Conference for a period of 45 to 60 days;

WHEREAS, this request is not being made for the purposes of delay, or any other improper purpose; instead, this request is being made to allow lead trial counsel to participate meaningfully at the CMC, and would provide the parties sufficient time to meet and confer to potentially resolve the pending issues with respect to a Rule 12 motion;

WHEREAS, continuing the Case Management Conference for a period of 45 to 60 days 1 2 will not prejudice either party or their counsel and will promote judicial economy; WHEREAS, moving the Case Management Conference for a period of 45 to 60 days will 3 allow for the defendants to appear in this action; 4 WHEREAS, the parties agree that the following constitutes good cause to continue the 5 initial CMC, including the deadlines for filing responsive pleadings, initial disclosures, meet and 6 confer regarding initial disclosures, the filing of responsive pleadings, and the filing of the joint 7 CMC statement; 8 9 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED and agreed by Plaintiff and Defendant, through their respective attorneys of record, that the Case Management Conference in 10 this action, currently set for April 30, 2007 at 4:00 p.m., be continued either to June 25, 2007 or 11 July 2, 2007 at 4:00 p.m., or to a date and time that the Court may deem appropriate. The parties 12 further stipulate to extend the following deadlines accordingly: (1) last day to complete initial 13 disclosures, state objections, and file joint CMC statement and file/serve Rule 26(f) report: June 14 11, 2007; (2) last day to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures and file Joint ADR 15 Certification with Stipulation: May 18, 2007; and (3) last day to file an answer and/or Rule 12 16 motion: May 8, 2007. 17 IT IS SO STIPULATED. 18 19 20 Dated: April 6, 2007 KAHN BROWN & POORE LLP 21 By: 22 David M. Poore Attorneys for Plaintiff 23 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 28 JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

| 1 | Dated: April 6, 2007 SPAULDING MCCULLOUGH & TANSIL LLP | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | By: | |
| 4 | Lisa Ann Hilario Attorneys for Defendant | |
| 5 | COUNTY OF SONOMA | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | Filer's Attestation: David M. Poore and Lisa Ann Hilario hereby attest that they have in their respective files their holograph signatures for any of their signatures indicated by a "conformed | |
| 8 | signature /s/ within this e-filed document. | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | ORDER | |
| 12 | Having reviewed the Stipulation of the parties, and good cause appearing: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the Case Management Conference in this action, | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | currently set for April 30, 2007, be continued toJune 25, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. inare hereby | |
| 16 | Courtroom 15, 18th Floor, San Francisco, California. The deadlines stated above will be re-set in | |
| 17 | accordance with the stipulation. | |
| 18 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 19 | STA | |
| 20 | Date: _April 23, 2007 | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | Judge Marilyn H. Patel | |
| 23 | Judge Marnyn 11 | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | THE DISTRICT OF CE | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | TO DISTINUTE ATTOM AND TPROPOSED LORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE | |

JOINT STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE PATENAUDE V. COUNTY OF SONOMA, ET AL., CASE NO. C06-07783 MHP